

## Interview Summary

Application No. 09/034,336

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Marjorie Moran

Group Art Unit 1623

Aga et al.

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):  (1) Merjorie Maran (3)  (2) Sheridan Nelmark (4)  Date of Interview Dec 20, 1999  Type:   Type:   Type:   Telephonic  Personal (copy is given to  applicant  applicant's representative).  Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:  Yes  No. If yes, brief description:  Agreement  as reached.  Was not reached.  Claim(s) discussed:  5-10 and 27-30  Identification of prior art discussed:  MARUTA, esp. col. 13, lines 7-64.  Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:  The examiner informed the attempt that the after-final amendment filed 12/7/99 had been entered, and that the after-final arguments had been considered, but the rejections of claims 5-10 and 27-30 were being maintained. MARUTA afters may apply the state of th			
Date of Interview	All participants (	applicant, applicant's representative, F	PTO personnel):
Type:   Telephonic   Personal (copy is given to   applicant   applicant's representative).  Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:   Yes   No. If yes, brief description:  Agreement   was reached.   Was not reached.  Claim(s) discussed: 5-10 and 27-30  Identification of prior art discussed: MARUTA, esp. col. 13, lines 7-64.  Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner informed the attorney that the after-final amendment filed 127/799 had been entered, and that the after-final arguments had been considered, but the rejections of claims 5-10 and 27-30 were being maintained. MARUTA does make obvious adding trehalose to aqueous systems. The examiner also maintained that a method of inhibiting a decrease in activity is inherently a method of stabilization. Also, MARUTA teaches that trehalose stabilizes antioxidants (i.e. compounds with active-oxygen eliminating activity). The examiner stated that she did not use hindsight reasoning, as all of the limitations of the claims may be found in the prior art, as set forth in the two previous office actions.  IA fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendents which would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendents which would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendents which would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the substance of the interview.  Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GYDLICANT IS GYDLICAN	(1) Marjorie Mor	an	(3)
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:  Yes No. If yes, brief description:  Agreement was reached. Was not reached.  Claim(s) discussed: 5-10 and 27-30  Identification of prior art discussed:  MARUTA, esp. col. 13, lines 7-64.  Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:  The examiner informed the attorney that the after-final amendment filed 12/7/99 had been entered, and that the after-final arguments had been considered, but the rejections of claims 5-10 and 27-30 were being maintained. MARUTA does make obvious adding trehalose to aqueous systems. The examiner also maintained that a method of inhibiting a decrease in activity is inherently a method of stabilization. Also, MARUTA teaches that trehalose stabilizes antioxidants (i.e. compounds with active-oxygen eliminating activity). The examiner stated that she did not use hindsight reasoning, as all of the limitations of the claims may be found in the prior art, as set forth in the two previous office actions.  [A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendents which would render the claims allowable must be attached.  [I it is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.  Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.  2. Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this com	(2) Sheridan Nei	mark	(4)
Agreement was reached. was not reached.  Claim(s) discussed: 5-10 and 27-30  Identification of prior art discussed:  MARUTA, esp. col. 13, lines 7-64.  Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:  The examiner informed the attorney that the after-final amendment filed 12/7/99 had been entered, and that the after-final arguments had been considered, but the rejections of claims 5-10 and 27-30 were being maintained. MARUTA does make obvious adding trehalose to aqueous systems. The examiner also maintained that a method of inhibiting adcrease in activity is inherently a method of stabilization. Also, MARUTA teaches that trehalose stabilizes antioxidants (i.e. compounds with active-oxygen eliminating activity). The examiner stated that she did not use hindsight reasoning, as all of the limitations of the claims may be found in the prior art, as set forth in the two previous office actions.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.  Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, a FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE of THE INTERVIEW.  2. Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this complete form is considered to fulfill the respons	Date of Interview	v <u>Dec 20, 1999</u>	
Agreement was reached. Xi was not reached.  Claim(s) discussed: 5-10 and 27-30  Identification of prior art discussed:  MARUTA, esp. col. 13, lines 7-64.  Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:  The examiner informed the attorney that the after-final amendment filed 12/7/99 had been entered, and that the  after-final arguments had been considered, but the rejections of claims 5-10 and 27-30 were being maintained that the  after-final arguments had been considered, but the rejections of claims 5-10 and 27-30 were being maintained that does make obvious adding trehalose to agreeous systems. The examiner also maintained that a method of inhibiting a  decrease in activity is inherently a method of stabilization. Also, MARUTA teaches that trehalose stabilizes antioxidants  (i.e. compounds with active-oxygen eliminating activity). The examiner stated that she did not use hindsight reasoning, as  all of the limitations of the claims may be found in the prior art, as set forth in the two previous office actions.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render  the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendents which would render the claims allowable  is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.  Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE  LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP  Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH  FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.  2. Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to  each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be	Type: 🛭 Telep	phonic Personal (copy is given to	applicant applicant's representative).
Claim(s) discussed: 5-10 and 27-30  Identification of prior art discussed:  MARUTA, esp. col. 13, lines 7-64.  Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:  The examiner informed the attorney that the after-final amendment filed 12/7/99 had been entered, and that the after-final arguments had been considered, but the rejections of claims 5-10 and 27-30 were being maintained. MARUTA does make obvious adding trehalose to aqueous systems. The examiner also maintained that a method of inhibiting a decrease in activity is inherently a method of stabilization. Also, MARUTA teaches that trehalose stabilizes anticivity. The examiner stated that she did not use hindsight reasoning, as all of the limitations of the claims may be found in the prior art, as set forth in the two previous office actions.  [A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendents which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.  1.   It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.  Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.  2.   Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate r	Exhibit shown o	demonstration conducted:	No. If yes, brief description:     ■
Claim(s) discussed: 5-10 and 27-30  Identification of prior art discussed:  MARUTA, esp. col. 13, lines 7-64.  Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:  The examiner informed the attorney that the after-final amendment filed 12/7/99 had been entered, and that the after-final arguments had been considered, but the rejections of claims 5-10 and 27-30 were being maintained. MARUTA does make obvious adding trehalose to aqueous systems. The examiner also maintained that a method of inhibiting a decrease in activity is inherently a method of stabilization. Also, MARUTA teaches that trehalose stabilizes anticivity. The examiner stated that she did not use hindsight reasoning, as all of the limitations of the claims may be found in the prior art, as set forth in the two previous office actions.  [A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendents which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.  1.   It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.  Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.  2.   Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate r			
Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:  The examiner informed the attorney that the after-final amendment filed 12/7/99 had been entered, and that the after-final arguments had been considered, but the rejections of claims 5-10 and 27-30 were being maintained. MARUTA does make obvious adding trehalose to aqueous systems. The examiner also maintained that a method of inhibiting a decrease in activity is inherently a method of stabilization. Also, MARUTA teaches that trehalose stabilizes antioxidants (i.e. compounds with active-oxygen eliminating activity). The examiner stated that she did not use hindsight reasoning, as all of the limitations of the claims may be found in the prior art, as set forth in the two previous office actions.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendents which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  1.   It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.  Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action, has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.  2.   Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action, Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also	Agreement $\square$	was reached. 🛛 was not reached.	
Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:  The examiner informed the attorney that the after-final amendment filed 12/7/99 had been entered, and that the after-final arguments had been considered, but the rejections of claims 5-10 and 27-30 were being maintained. MARUTA does make obvious adding trehalose to aqueous systems. The examiner also maintained that a method of inhibiting a decrease in activity is inherently a method of stabilization. Also, MARUTA teaches that trehalose stabilizes antioxidants (i.e. compounds with active-oxygen eliminating activity). The examiner stated that she did not use hindsight reasoning, as all of the limitations of the claims may be found in the prior art, as set forth in the two previous office actions.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendents which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  1.  It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.  Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.  2.   Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also ch	Claim(s) discuss	ed: <u>5-10 and 27-30</u>	
The examiner informed the attorney that the after-final amendment filed 12/7/99 had been entered, and that the after-final arguments had been considered, but the rejections of claims 5-10 and 27-30 were being maintained. MARUTA does make obvious adding trehalose to aqueous systems. The examiner also maintained that a method of inhibiting a decrease in activity is inherently a method of stabilization. Also, MARUTA teaches that trehalose stabilizes antioxidants (i.e. compounds with active-oxygen eliminating activity). The examiner stated that she did not use hindsight reasoning, as all of the limitations of the claims may be found in the prior art, as set forth in the two previous office actions.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendents which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  1.   It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.  Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.  2.   Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.		•	
the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendents which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.  Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.  2. Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.	The examiner in after-final argum does make obvidecrease in actifice. compounds	formed the attorney that the after-financents had been considered, but the rejects adding trehalose to aqueous system vity is inherently a method of stabilization with active-oxygen eliminating activity	I amendment filed 12/7/99 had been entered, and that the ections of claims 5-10 and 27-30 were being maintained. MARUTA ms. The examiner also maintained that a method of inhibiting a tion. Also, MARUTA teaches that trehalose stabilizes antioxidants y). The examiner stated that she did not use hindsight reasoning, as
the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendents which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.  Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.  2. Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.			
Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.  2. Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.	the claims allow	able must be attached. Also, where n	mendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render no copy of the amendents which would render the claims allowable
LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.  2. Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.	1. 🛭 It is not	necessary for applicant to provide a s	eparate record of the substance of the interview.
each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.	LAST OFFICE A	CTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST IN . If a response to the last Office action	NCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP on has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH
MC Mayor	each of claims a Office a	the objections, rejections and requirent are now allowable, this completed form action. Applicant is not relieved from p	nents that may be present in the last Office action, and since the n is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last
The size New Year and size and stems this form values it is an attachment to a signed Office action A/10 540 0001	Form No. 27		s an attachment to a signed Office action MG Maran